DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 106 824 95 CS 001 876

TITLE	[Atlanta Right to Read Project.]
INSTITUTION	Atlanta Public Schools, Ga.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Right to Read Program.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	34p.; See CS 001 934 for "Effective Reading Programs: Summaries of 222 Selected Programs"
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Disadvantaged Youth; *Effective Teaching; Elementary Education; Reading Diagnosis; Reading Improvement; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; *Remedial Reading
IDENTIFIERS	*Effective Reading Programs; Right to Read

ABSTRACT

This program, included in "Effective Reading Programs...," serves 1,200 students in K-5 at three elementary schools. Most of the students are black, live in the inner area of a large city, and come from low-income families. The program provides an opportunity for diagnostic treatment, remediation, motivation, and observation of each individual student. For example, at six-week intervals, children are given several comprehensive diagnostic tests. The major purpose of these tests is to give the teachers periodic informal evaluations of pupils' strengths and weaknesses in selected reading skills and to guide them in pinpointing the instructional needs of specific children. The general program objectives are as follows: to provide developmental and corrective reading experiences for all students in the program; to improve academic achievement; to organize reading centers providing special reading instruction for the most severely retarded students; to encourage teachers to use a variety of reading materials and teaching techniques; and to involve students, teachers, and parent tutors in a nontraditional learning environment. Inservice training is an important component and features bimonthly workshops. (WR)

Approval Expires 31 Jan

Center for Research and Evaluation
in the Applications of Technology in Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED106824

PROGRAM INFORMATION FORM

Identifying, Validating and Multi-Media Packaging of Successful Reading Programs

A Project sponsored by
The National Right to Read Program
U.S. Office of Education

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Please answer each item carefully and completely before you return this form. The information you provide will be used for evaluating your program for further consideration in this study.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CS001876

A•I•R ◇ CREATE ☐ P.O. BOX 1113, PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA 94302 (LOCATION: 1791 ARASTRADERO ROAD) ☐ TEL. (415) 49
CABLE ADDRESS: AIRESEARCH/PALO ALTO

PROGRAM INFORMATION FORM

SECTION I -- Identification Information

Program Title Right-to-Read (1)

Program Director Louise George Title CIP* Reading Coordinator (2)

Address 2930 Forrest Hill Dr.,S. W., Atlanta, Georgia 30315 Phone 761-5411

Sponsor (school district or other) Atlanta Public Schools (3)

Superintendent or director Dr. Alonzo A. Crim

Address 224 Central Avenue, S. W. Phone 659-3381

Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Address where your program is operating (4)

E. A. Ware - 569 Hunter St., N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Herndon - 1075 Simpson Rd., N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Fowler - 595 Fowler St., N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30313

If you know any, please list one or two other school districts or sponsoring institutions where the total program named in Item 1 is being duplicated. (5)

Educational Facility	Address and Zip Code

* The Comprehensive Instruction Program (CIP) is a locally funded project. Its purpose is to provide diagnostic measures and inservice training for teachers to insure pupil development in reading and math. Tests are supplied to teachers for development of diagnostic prescriptions several times each year.

SECTION II -- Program Screening Information

In this section, all questions are numbered at the right-hand edge; please answer each by marking the letter X in the appropriate box.

Is cognitive improvement in reading and reading-related skills a major focus of your program?		YES [X]	NO [ ] **	(
How long has your program been operating continuously?	Less than a year	[ ]		(
	At least a year but less than two years	[ ]		
	Two years but less than three	[X]		
	Three years or more	[ ]		
	None of these (If none, indicate why)	[ ]		
	_____			
Do you plan to keep your program operating for at least two more years (through the 1974-75 academic year)? Current program funding is scheduled to terminate in August, 1974. However, a new proposal is being submitted and the Atlanta system will continue successful components identified from the 3 years of program development.	(If no, indicate why not)	YES [X]	NO [ ]	(
Are evaluation reports (e.g., baseline test data, re-test data, measures of the program's effect) available?	None available and none planned	[ ]	**	(
	None available but initial steps taken	[ ]		
	Available but not published	[ ]		
	Most recent publication prior to 1/1/68	[ ]		
	Most recent publication since 1/1/68	[X]		
Evaluation data are available for how long?	Three years or more	[ ]		(
	More than two years, less than three	[X]		
	More than one year, less than two	[ ]		
	Only one year	[ ]		
	Less than one year	[ ]		
	Not available	[ ]	**	

Are the data evaluating your total program approach available for one or more sites?	More than one site (e.g., more than one school)	[X]	(11)
	Your site only	[ ]	
	Not available	[ ]	

How many participants or individual records are included in the evaluation?	Less than 10	[ ] **	(12)
	10 to 29	[ ]	
	30 to 49	[ ]	
	50 to 99	[ ]	
	100 to 199	[ ]	
	200 to 499	[ ]	
	500 or more	[X]	

If you marked any one of these boxes, do not complete this form or send program documents. INSTEAD, please detach the first 3 pages and return them so that your response can be recorded.

What measures have been analyzed to show the success of your program?

	YES	NO	
Analysis of nationally standardized reading test results	[X]	[ ]	(13)
Analysis of locally developed reading test results	[X]	[ ]	(14)
Analysis of nationally standardized general ability measures	[ ]	[X]	(15)
Analysis of locally developed general ability measures	[ ]	[X]	(16)
Analysis of other program success indicators (e.g., observations, affective measures, teacher records, questionnaires)	[X]	[ ]	(17)
Other procedures (Please specify) _____	[ ]	[X]	(18)
Measures not yet analyzed	[ ]	[X]	(19)

Are up-to-date program descriptions available (e.g., staff, participants, schedules and activities)?

	YES	NO	
	X		(2

What kind of improvement or gain by program students was found?

	YES	NO	
The mean test score of the students exceeds a specified norm *	X		(2
A mean gain over exactly one year is bigger than expected	X		(2
A mean gain for less than one year is bigger than expected **	X		(2
The mean of students in the program exceeds that of comparable students not in the program ***		X	(24
The mean gain of students in the program is greater than for comparable students not in the program ***	X		(25
Some other improvement, not one of these (Please specify)		X	(26

* Predicted gain is based on an equation statistically determined by a linear multiple step-wise regression which weighted six factors - past scores on standardized tests; socio-economic level of school community; mobility rates of pupils; attendance; pupil-teacher ratio; and per cent of pupils passing.

** In many cases, predicted (or expected) gain is less than a month for each month of instruction. The tests were given in October and April, 1972-73.

*** These figures were taken from the predicted achievement quotient, national achievement quotient figure for 1972-73.

How significant were the statistical results showing the effect of your program?

No tests of significance were made	X	(27)
No significant differences found yet		
The program showed differences significant between the 5 and 10 percent one-tailed (10 to 20 two-tailed) level		
The program showed differences significant at better than the 5 percent one-tailed (10 per cent two-tailed) level		
The program showed differences significant at better than the one percent one-tailed (two per cent two-tailed) level		

* Pupil data is available but tests of significance have not been done.

By what amount does the annual per-pupil cost of this program exceed that of the regular district program?

Less than $50	☐
$50 to $99 (1962-73) (72.42)	X
$100 to $199	☐
$200 to $299	☐
$300 to $399	☐
$400 to $499	☐
$500 to $999	☐
$1000 or more	☐

For what target population of students is your program designed?

	YES	NO	
Unselected cross section	☐	X	(29)
Mentally retarded	☐	X	(30)
Bilingual	☐	X	(31)
Disadvantaged	X	☐	(32)
Physically handicapped (deaf, blind, etc.)	☐	X	(33)
Institutionalized	☐	X	(34)
Other groups (Please specify below)	☐	X	(35)

_____

Are 20 percent or more of your program students in any of the following categories?

	YES	NO	
American Eskimo, Aleut, or Indian	☐	X	(36)
Black	X	☐	(37)
Oriental or Asian	☐	X	(38)
Spanish-speaking	☐	X	(39)
White *	X	X	(40)
All others	☐	☐	(41)

* 35% of the pupils at Fowler Elementary School are white.

In which area do the majority of the program students live?

- Rural and small town of less than 10,000 [ ]
- Small city of 10,000-199,000 [ ]
- Small city suburbs [ ]
- Inner area in large city of 200,000 or more [X]
- Residential area in large city [ ]
- Suburbs of a large city [ ]

What is the average family income level of students in the program?

- Low income (under $6,000) [X]
- Middle income ($6,000-$15,000) [ ]
- High income (above $15,000) [ ]

Are specific diagnostic techniques or instruments used to:

Determine each student's level of reading readiness or skill (e.g., his reading grade level)? YES [X] NO [ ]
(If yes, please specify)

CIP, PRI, Informal Reading Inventory

Determine each student's strengths, weaknesses, and difficulties in language and reading skills (e.g., difficulty with decoding)? YES [X] NO [ ]
(If yes, please specify)

CIP, PRI, IRI

In this program, how many hours per week are scheduled for the subject Language Arts?

- Less than 2 hours [ ]
- 2 hours to 3 hours 59 minutes [ ]
- 4 hours to 5 hours 59 minutes [ ]
- 6 hours to 7 hours 59 minutes [ ]
- 8 hours to 9 hours 59 minutes [ ]
- 10 hours to 11 hours 59 minutes [X]
- 12 hours or more [ ]

What summary statistics were used in the analysis of program data?

	YES	NO	
Means or medians	X		(4
Standard deviations or variances		X	(4
Covariances or correlation coefficients	X		(4
Frequency counts, percentages, or proportions	X		(5
Significance tests	X		(5
Methods not mentioned above (Please specify)		X	(5

_____

* predicted - 6 factors - Ware

How large was the estimated program effect on achievement (i.e., the average gain of students in the program over and above the gain expected in a comparison group)?* (If more than one estimation, give the higher figure only.)

One-tenth of a standard deviation unit		(53
One-fifth of a standard deviation unit		
One-quarter of a standard deviation unit		
One-third of a standard deviation unit		
One-half of a standard deviation unit		
Better than a half SD		
Gain cannot be given this way	X	

* data from predicted achievement scores shows which grades in R2R ~~schools~~ exceeded expected gains. City-wide comparisons are not available.

Which of these factors were taken into explicit account in the analyses of BOTH program AND comparison data?

	YES	NO	
Age			(54
Sex			(55
Grade level	X		(56
Ethnic proportions in group			(57
Past scores	X		
Socio-economic levels	X		
Mobility rates	X		
Attendance	X		
Pupil-Teacher ratio	X		
Per cent of pupils	X		

What was the reliability coefficient of the test used to measure reading achievement for this program?

- Between .6 and .69 ☐
- Between .7 and .79 ☐
- Between .8 and .89 ☐
- .9 and over ☒
- Given by publishers for standardization group only as over .8 ☐
- Not yet determined ☐
- No such test was used ☐

What percentage of annual attrition or loss of students from the program was allowed for, to correct for bias in statistical analysis (e.g., by eliminating from consideration persons who start the program but do not finish)?

- Was 15 percent or more * ☒
- Was between 10 and 14.9 percent ☐
- Was between 5 and 9.9 percent ☐
- Was between 0 and 4.9 percent ☐
- No allowance was made for losses ☐
- No losses occurred ☐

* Mean percentage of pupils moving into or out of the three R2R schools between September '72 and June, '73.

How similar were the pre- and post-tests used to determine gain in reading skills?

- Were identical * ☒
- Were parallel forms of a single test ☐
- Were consecutive forms from the same source ☐
- Were similar in form, but from different sources ☐
- Only one test has been applied ☐
- Tests were not of reading skills ☐
- No tests were applied ☐

* Form 5 was used in the Fall, '72 on the assumption that the city-wide spring testing would use Form 6. However, the city used Form 5 in the Spring.

SECTION III -- Brief Descriptive Information

In what year did the program begin operation? January, 1972 (Year) (6

How many program participants and classes (groups) are there in your program? If this is a school-based program, indicate enrollment by class and grade level. (62

Grade or Other Level	Number of Participants	Number of Classes or Groups
K	194	7
1	217	8
2	216	9
3	133	9
4	217	9
5	182	8
Spec. Ed.	22	2

Please list the major instructional strategies used to help clients improve their reading-related skills. Briefly describe, if necessary. * (63

A. "Six-prong approach"

1. School tone
2. ~~Teaching style~~
3. Curriculum
4. ~~Demonstration~~
5. Inservice
6. ~~Community involvement~~

B. Parent tutors to help individualize and release teachers for inservice.

*descriptions can be found in Blueprint for Committment, page 2.

Are there any major program features (e.g., parent involvement) which are not included in your list of instructional strategies above and are not included in your list of key program objectives in the chart at the end of this questionnaire? If so, please list up to three (3) of these major program features. Briefly describe, if necessary. (64

1. Demonstration teachers task force from Ware conducted inservice at Herndon and Luckie in 1972-73. In 1973-74 teachers from Ware and Herndon will be working with staff from Fowler.

Please list up to five (5) kinds of materials and/or equipment which are absolutely indispensable for your program, noting their availability as "commercial," "district," "teacher-prepared," "student-prepared," or other appropriate comment.

Most Essential Items of Materials and/or Equipment	Quantity for 30 Students	Availability
Phonics We Use	Whatever Needed	Commercial
Barnell-Loft Specific Skills	Whatever Needed	Commercial
SRA Reading Kits	1 Kit	Commercial
Continental Press Reading/Thinking Skills	Whatever Needed	Commercial
Classroom Paperback Libraries	$1.50 per room	Commercial

Where are program activities physically located? If any special features were provided to suit these facilities to the program, briefly note. (66

Location of Program Activities	Special Features
In-School	A. Reading Center was developed in each Right to Read school.

What is the total cost of instructional materials for a class of 30? (67

$1,402 for a class of 30, to the nearest dollar

To the nearest dollar, roughly what portion of the funds currently required to maintain the program come from the following sources? Please specify the exact source for each category, e.g., Title III. (68

$121,236 Federal Right to Read

$ ____ State

$ ____ Local

$ ____ Private

What is the average, annual per-pupil cost for the district's regular school program (i.e., cost per pupil for students outside the special reading program described herein)? (6

$ 640.00, per-pupil cost for regular program

What are the staff requirements for your program?

Staff Category	# Req'd. for Students	Portion of Time	Special Professional Qualifications for Program	Special Role Performed in Program	Program Requires Inservice Training? If so: In What Skills?	For How Many Hours
ADMINISTRATIVE:	3 principals 1 director 1 coordinator	All as Needed	-Certified -Administrators	Director of All CIP schools coordinates	Reading, Management	72 hours
INSTRUCTIONAL: (Certified)	Herndon-28 Ware - 25 Fowler- 17	All	Certified	Classroom teachers. 1 Reading teacher (operates reading center) itinerant teachers in: art speech music sight Band	Language arts and math	24 hours
PARAPROFESSIONAL: (Parent tutors)	5 per school (15)	4 hrs. daily	Must be indigenous to school community.	Assist classrm. teachers. Release teachers for inservice.	Reading	40 hours.
SUPPORT OR SPECIAL RESOURCE:	CIP Reading director (APS) Area Reading Resource Personnel Testing & Guidance R&D, Learning Resources Area Supts.	When Needed	Certified	Supportive		None
OTHER.	Unit task force Technical Asst. team	Quarterly 8days/yr.	Teachers/administrators in program. University professors appointed by national Right to Read office.	Organize plan, implement RtoR program in each school Train unit task forces. Provide inservice for teachers	None	None

should read consistently across columns.)

(71

Major objectives of the program (List the key objectives, even if they cannot be adequately tested or were difficult to measure.)	What assessment techniques and instruments were used to measure student achievement of each objective in Column 1? For example: Test--Specify title, level, form, and developer or publisher Observation--Of what? By whom? Teacher report--Of what? Questionnaire--About what? Answered by whom? Etc.	What were the results? How did the target group perform or change? (See two attached evaluation reports)
1. to raise the average reading level of students one month of instruction. 2. to organize reading centers in each school to offer special reading instruction. 3. to utilize parent tutor aide in each reading center. 4. to involve students, staff, and parent (tutors) in a non-traditional learning environment. 5. to give teachers access to, and to encourage use of a variety of materials and techniques.	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) Evaluation: Atlanta Right-to-Read " " " " " " " " " " " "	1. A total pupil gain of nearly one month for each month of instruction. 2. Mean gains of tutored pupils were higher than one month for each month of instruction. 3. Accomplished in all 3 schools. 4. Very positive in 2 of the schools. 4. Very positive in 2 of the schools.

14

Return to:

John E. Bowers

American Institutes for Research

P. O. Box 1113

Palo Alto, California 94302

We would appreciate it if you would return this form by First Class mail. Documents may be sent under separate cover.

ATLANTA'S RIGHT-TO-READ PROGRAM, 1972-73

A BLUEPRINT FOR COMMITMENT

Joyce McWilliams
Acting Research Assistant
Research and Development
Atlanta Public Schools

ATLANTA'S RIGHT-TO-READ -- A SIX PRONG APPROACH AND ITS EFFECT ON E. A. WARE, LUCKIE STREET AND A. F. HERNDON ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

In 1972-73 three elementary schools in the Atlanta School System were involved in the Right-to-Read Project: E. A. Ware, Luckie Street, and A. F. Herndon. The goals and objectives of the national Right-to-Read effort demand full community cooperation and participation in local programs. As Ware Elementary School had been involved in the Educational Improvement Project since 1965, a program which also hinges on cooperative community involvement, Ware was chosen as the impact sight for Right-to-Read. Success of the program at Ware was then replicated in the two satellite schools, Herndon and Luckie. Development of the local program was based on the following assumptions:

1. That measurable intelligence can be developed or improved by stimulating environmental situations.

2. That reading is an important aspect of communication and can be developed and expanded throughout life.

3. That the establishment of reading centers for remediation will provide opportunity for diagnostic treatment, motivation, observation, and growth of each individual student.

4. That reading, a communicative skill, is closely related to listening, speaking, and writing. These four language arts are sequentially related to one another.

5. That the reader's facility in the use of language is directly related to comprehension.

6. That the improvement of reading skills will improve the achievement in the content areas.

7. That the extension of psychological, mental, social, and emotional experiences of the students will result in the development of an improved citizenry better prepared for the future.

General program objectives were:

1. To provide developmental and corrective reading experiences for all students enrolled in kindergarten through grade seven.

2. To organize reading centers providing remedial work for the most severly retarded students.

3. To focus attention on raising the sights of all students involved in the program.

4. To upgrade teaching techniques of all teachers.

5. To improve the academic achievement in the content areas of all students as a result of an increased reading efficiency.

The design for Ware's successful reading program hinged on a "six prong approach" to school achievement. The six prongs were (1) school tone, (2) teaching style, (3) curriculum, (4) demonstration, (5) inservice, and (6) community involvement.

School tone includes the physical aspects of the school plant, administrative philosophy, emotional mood of faculty and students as well as learning environment, the focus on change and community involvement.

Teaching style centers attention on diagnostic procedures of teachers, individualization of instruction, evaluation and interaction of teachers and students in the learning environment; including the physical aspects of the room, teacher decorum, and management.

The curriculum refers to content, subject matter, or that which is to be taught and learned.

Demonstration teaching refers to observing sequential teaching of reading skills on a grade level for a given number of weeks or months.

Inservice education includes planned regular instruction on school time. In addition it includes evaluation of instruction by outside consultants, attendance at local, state, and national professional meetings, and visits within the schools as well as reimbursing tuition to teachers and librarians for one graduate course in the reading sequence taken during the summer.

Community involvement encompasses hiring and training of a given number of community parents as part-time parent tutors; to assist classroom teachers in providing students with optimal learning opportunities, which in turn will help them (parents) function more effectively as facilitators of learning. Parent tutors also relieve the classroom teacher for scheduled inservice sessions.

The Atlanta Public School System committed itself to the Right-to-Read effort by making the following resources available as an integral part of the program:

Comprehensive Instructional Program - Supplies and schedules administration of CIP tests for grades one through three (in 1973-74, grades one through seven). Personnel to aid teachers in interpreting results.

Testing and Guidance Services - Supply and schedule administration of standardized achievement pretest and posttest.

Research and Development - Evaluation of student achievement, assessment of effectiveness of program, and dissemination of information.

Department of Learning Resources in Title I - Media specialists and librarians are available for services when needed.

Area I Resource Personnel - (In 1973-74 this will include Area IV Resource Personnel.)

The specific objectives and procedures of the Atlanta Right-to-Read Program are as follows:

1. To raise the average reading level of students one month for each month of instruction.

2. To organize reading centers in each school to offer special reading instruction to selected students in grades four through seven, and to improve the instructional skills of the faculties.

3. To involve students, staff, and parents in a learning environment that breaks "traditional" teaching methods.

4. To utilize parent tutor aides efficiently for individualized and small group instruction.

5. To give teachers access to a wide range of materials, and to encourage utilization of a variety of techniques.

In order to implement these objectives and procedures through the six prong approach the following steps were taken:

Implementation of Six-Prong Approach

GOALS	ACTION STEPS
Positive School Tone	1. Faculty and Staff re-orientation sessions on the purpose and procedures of local R_2R Program.
	2. School Organization explained.
	3. Reading Centers established and students assigned.
	4. Learning Centers organized in each classroom.
	5. Cultural enrichment activities for pupils and parents.

Teaching Style	1. Eighteen two-hour workshop sessions with teachers on each grade level stressing phonics, comprehension, and classroom organization.
	2. Purchase of books for teachers. (Julie Hay, Charles Wingo, Mary C. Hletke, Reading With Phonics).
	3. Invite consultants.
Curriculum	1. Interpret and evaluate achievement test scores.
	2. Administer EIP developed reading diagnostic test.
	3. Sequential behavioral objectives in all subject areas to be analyzed and used in prescribing for individualized instruction.
Demonstration	1. Impact school teachers will demonstrate the sequential teaching of reading skills on grade levels. Follow-up and feedback will be available through scheduled weekly visitations of coordinator to satellite schools. Help to individual teachers will be possible by releasing certain skilled teachers from the impact schools.
Community Involvement	1. In-service training program for parent-tutors once weekly.
	2. Utilizing parent-tutors to releive classroom teachers for in-service meetings.
Evaluation (Internal)	1. Pre- and Post data on the reading growth of students in the program is to be secured through the Atlanta Public School System's testing program. Test data will include Iowa Tests of Basic Skills.

2. Students' growth through reading will be evaluated by comparative data on free reading, and teacher observations.

Evaluation (External)

1. Invite consultants to assess effectiveness of instruction.

Evaluation for 1972-73

At each of the three schools involved with Right-to-Read in 1972-73, a group of about 60 pupils were tutored in the Right-to-Read Learning Center. Matched pretest/posttest scores and gains of tutored and nontutored participants are reported in Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4.

At Herndon, higher scoring pupils were tutored because Title I was remediating the lower scoring pupils. The tutored pupils in grades five and seven made larger numerical gains than did the nontutored pupils. However, across grades four through seven, there was no significant difference between the gains made by the tutored and the nontutored groups. At all grades the tutored pupils had higher mean pretest and posttest scores. None of the groups achieved national norms, although all grades of tutored pupils were within six months of norms.

At Luckie, the lowest scoring pupils were tutored by Right-to-Read. What is most impressive at this school is that while all tutored groups pretests were considerably lower than the nontutored participants, in every grade except the seventh the posttest scores of the tutored pupils were considerably higher than the school as a whole. Separate posttests and gain scores for the nontutored pupils were not available for this school. The total posttest scores, then, are composite of the tutored participants' posttests and the non-tutored. In grades four, five, and six the nontutored participants posttest scores alone would have been lower than the total grade posttest, making the difference between tutored and nontutored participants even greater than the difference reported between the tutored and total school.

At Ware, the tutored pupils were also chosen from among the top scores on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills pretest. In every case except the seventh grade, the tutored pupils had higher pretest and posttest than the nontutored participants. In every grade except the sixth the tutored pupils gains were also higher. Also, as at Herndon, there was no significant difference between gain scores of tutored and nontutored participants.

TABLE 1

MATCHED PRETEST/POSTTEST AND GAIN SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS AND NON-PARTICIPANTS IN THE RIGHT-TO-READ TUTORIAL PROGRAM AND TOTAL GRADE ON THE READING SUBTEST OF THE IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

E. A. WARE

Groups	N=	Pre	Post	Gain
4th Grade				
Tutorial Participants	17	4.0	4.7	.7
Non-Tutorial	55	2.9	3.5	.6
Total	72	3.2	3.8	.6
5th Grade				
Tutorial Participants	29	4.4	4.8	.4
Non-Tutorial	27	3.4	3.9	.5
Total	56	4.0	4.4	.4
6th Grade				
Tutorial Participants	6	4.8	5.8	1.0
Non-Tutorial	10	4.1	4.6	.5
Total	16	4.3	5.1	.8
7th Grade				
Tutorial Participants	6	4.4	5.2	.8
Non-Tutorial	8	4.6	5.3	.7
Total	14	4.5	5.3	.8

TABLE 2

MATCHED PRETEST/POSTTEST AND GAIN SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS AND AND NON-PATICIPANTS IN THE RIGHT-TO-READ TUTORIAL PROGRAM AND TOTAL GRADE ON THE READING SUBTEST OF THE IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

A. F. HERNDON

Groups	N=	Grade Equivalent		
		Pre	Post	Gain
4th Grade				
Tutorial Participants	16	4.0	4.2	0.2
Non-Tutorial	56	2.9	3.3	0.4
Total	72	3.2	3.5	0.3
5th Grade				
Tutorial Participants	19	4.9	5.5	0.6
Non-Tutorial	56	3.6	3.9	0.3
Total	75	4.0	4.3	0.3
6th Grade				
Tutorial Participants	11	5.8	6.3	0.4
Non-Tutorial	74	4.2	4.8	0.6
Total	85	4.4	4.9	0.5
7th Grade				
Tutorial Participants	16	6.2	7.0	0.8
Non-Tutorial	50	4.4	4.9	0.5
Total	66	4.8	5.4	0.6

TABLE 3

MATCHED PRETEST/POSTTEST AND GAIN SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS AND NON-PARTICIPANTS IN THE RIGHT TO-READ TUTORIAL PROGRAM AND TOTAL GRADE ON THE READING SUBTEST OF THE IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

LUCKIE STREET

Groups	N=	Pre	Post	Gain
4th Grade				
Tutorial Participants	16	3.0	4.0	1.0
Non-Tutorial		3.7		
Total		3.1	3.7	.6
5th Grade				
Tutorial Participants	7	3.3	5.4	2.1
Non-Tutorial		4.1		
Total		3.7	4.1	.4
6th Grade				
Tutorial Participants	6	4.3	5.7	1.4
Non-Tutorial		5.0		
Total		4.8	5.0	.2
7th Grade				
Tutorial Participants	10	5.3	6.2	0.9
Non-Tutorial		6.7		
Total		5.6	6.7	1.1

TABLE 4

TOTAL MEAN PRETEST/POSTTEST AND GAIN SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE RIGHT-TO-READ PROGRAM ON THE READING SUBTEST OF THE IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

Groups	N=	Pre	Post	Gain
4th Grade				
Tutorial Participants	49	3.7	4.3	.6
Total	--	3.2	3.7	.5
5th Grade				
Tutorial Participants	55	4.2	5.2	1.0
Total	--	3.9	4.3	.4
6th Grade				
Tutorial Participants	23	5.0	5.9	.9
Total	--	4.5	5.0	.5
7th Grade				
Tutorial Participants	32	5.3	6.1	.8
Total	--	5.0	5.8	.8

All three schools did organize and are operating reading centers. As every child in each participating school is technically a "Right-to-Read" pupil, all faculty members receive in-class and on-site inservice, and all pupils have access to center materials. Interest centers, and the use of art and drama to integrate reading and language arts into all phases of curriculum were developed and are being used at all class levels. Across-school training and demonstrations are facilitated by use of the parent tutors, who fill-in in the classrooms when the teachers are receiving instruction.

To summarize pupil test results then, at all three schools, with few exceptions, the Right-to-Read tutored participants did gain a months score for each month of instruction. Ware and Herndon tutored participants were chosen from high pretest scorers because Title I was remediating the low scoring pupils. In all cases, Title I personnel provided assistance in program planning and implementation.

In keeping with the commitment of Right-to-Read to encourage teachers to utilize a variety of techniques and most particularly to individualize instruction and provide highly motivating material to their pupils, the Opinionnaire on Attitudes Toward Education developed by Lindgren and Patton was administered to all teachers and aides at Ware and Herndon and to all Right-to-Read parent tutors at Herndon, Luckie, and Ware. This instrument was constructed to measure attitudes toward child-centered policies and practices in education. Teachers' attitudes toward education play an important part in creating school climate, and a child-centered rather than subject-centered climate is necessary in moving toward individualization.

The instrument is a 50-item scale. The statements are concerned with the desirability of understanding the behavior of students, the desirability of the teachers using authoritarian methods as a means of controlling the behavior of students, and the desirability of subject matter centeredness as compared with learner child centeredness.

The attitude score is the number of positive items agreed with plus the number of negative items disagreed with, where positive items are favorable toward child centered practices. The theoretical range of scores is from 0 to 50, with the highest scores indicating more favorable attitudes toward child-centered policies and practices in education.

Twenty-six teachers and aides from Herndon responded to the Questionnaire. Their mean score was 37.0 with a range of 29 through 46. Twenty-eight teachers and aides at Ware responded to the Questionnaire and had a mean score of 36.8. The Title IV-A Day Care staff also responded to the Questionnaire, and of the eleven responding the mean score was 34.7. All the Right-to-Read parent tutors responded to the Questionnaire, five at Herndon, five at Luckie Street, and six at Ware. Their mean score was 32.2.

These scores are high enough to indicate favorable attitudes in all groups toward child-centered policies and practices. These data are presented in Tables five and six.

Luckie Street school was closed at the end of the 1972-73 school year due to shifting population patterns. Fowler Elementary School is to take its place in this final funded year of Right-to-Read. It would seem at this point that the project has achieved stated purposes and is providing information to the entire school system on the planning, implementation, operation, and evaluation of a new, totally integrated approach to reading instruction in the elementary schools.

TABLE 5

OPINIONNAIRE ON ATTITUDES TOWARD EDUCATION
WARE, APRIL, 1973

	Mean	N=
Day Care		
Teachers with Aides	34.7	3
Aides	34.8	8
Total Day Care	34.7	11
Elementary		
Teachers with Aides	35.1	13
Teachers without Aides	37.9	11
Aide COP*	39.5	2
Aide non-COP*	37.5	2
Total Elementary	36.8	28
(Principal - 43)		

*All elementary aides were paid under Title I. However, the Career Opportunities Program (COP) aides were also supported as college education majors by COP.

TABLE 6

OPINIONNAIRE ON ATTITUDES TOWARD EDUCATION
APRIL, 1973

RIGHT-TO-READ PARENT-TUTORS

	Mean	N=
Herndon	33.6	5
Luckie Street	32.2	5
E. A. Ware	31.0	6
OVERALL	32.2	16

ADDENDUM, FALL 1973

Fowler Elementary School has replaced Luckie as a satellite Right-to-Read site. Teachers from Ware and Herndon have been conducting regular inservice in principles and methods of the Right-to-Read concept to all staff at Fowler.

Profiles of all Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) scores given in April, 1973 are shown in Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4. The summary index shows the per cent of achievement of predicted scores and of national norms. Herndon was the only Right-to-Read school which did not reach at least an average 100 per cent of prediction. They were an average of 97 per cent of prediction -- but the predicted scores for this school were higher than for the others.

In 1972 and 1973 selected pupils were tutored in the Right-to-Read reading centers. This process is described in "Blueprint for Commitment." However, in 1973-74, the reading centers have been turned over to the general school use, most specifically, Title I. The Right-to-Read parent-tutors are involved in direct classroom work, and still provide individualized and small group instruction, and release time for teacher inservice.

This fall, all Right-to-Read schools contain only grade K-5; the sixth and seventh grades having been transferred to middle schools. Tabel 5, then, contains comparison of ITBS reading subtest scores for fourth grade tutored and non-tutored pupils (spring 1973) and matched fifth grade former tutored and former non-tutored pupils (fall 1973). No pupils are being R_2R lab-tutored this year, and all are receiving benefits of parent tutors in the classroom, yet Table 5 shows that the former tutored pupils are maintaining their significantly higher test scores.

Table 6 reports the fall 1973 mean reading subtest scores at the participating schools. In comparing this fall's scores with the reading test data in Tables 1, 2, and 4, it can be seen that most grades are progressing. However, this is not a direct comparison as last spring's reading data is a composite of several subtest scores.

Identification of significantly effective program components is under way, so that these aspects of Right-to-Read may be replicated in other Atlanta Public Schools (as in the satellite schools -- Herndon, Luckie, and Fowler) in the future.

C5081 876

TABLE 1

WARE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

PROFILES OF ACHIEVEMENT QUOTIENTS
IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS, APRIL, 1973

Grade	Grade Equivalent Score			Summary Indices	
	Actual Achievement	Predicted Achievement	National Norm	Predicted Achievement Quotient	National Achievement Quotient
			Reading Test Data		
2	2.0	1.9	2.7	106	72
3	3.2	2.5	3.8	128	84
4	3.6	3.3	4.7	108	76
5	4.1	3.9	5.7	105	72
6	4.9	4.5	6.7	109	73
7	4.9	5.3	7.6	91	64
			Average	107	73
			Mathematics Test Data		
2	2.3	2.1	2.6	110	88
3	3.0	2.7	3.7	111	81
4	3.9	3.6	4.7	106	83
5	5.1	4.3	5.6	119	90
6	5.1	5.0	6.6	102	76
7	5.6	5.9	7.6	95	73
			Average	107	81
			Composite Test Data		
2	2.2	2.1	2.6	105	83
3	3.3	2.7	3.7	121	88
4	3.9	3.6	4.7	108	83
5	4.6	4.2	5.7	110	80
6	5.9	4.8	6.7	123	88
7	6.1	5.7	7.6	107	80
			Average	112	83

The Predicted Achievement Quotient equals the Actual Achievement divided by the Predicted Achievement Quotient. The National Achievement Quotient is the Actual Achievement divided by the National Norm.

TABLE 2

HERNDON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

PROFILES OF ACHIEVEMENT QUOTIENTS
IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS, APRIL, 1973

Grade	Grade Equivalent Score			Summary Indices	
	Actual Achievement	Predicted Achievement	National Norm	Predicted Achievement Quotient	National Achievement Quotient
			Reading Test Data		
2	2.1	2.2	2.7	95	76
3	2.5	2.6	3.8	95	66
4	3.3	3.3	4.7	100	70
5	4.1	4.0	5.7	102	72
6	4.8	4.7	6.7	102	71
7	5.2	5.2	7.6	100	68
			Average	99	70
			Mathematics Tests Data		
2	2.2	2.3	2.6	95	84
3	2.4	2.8	3.7	87	65
4	3.5	3.4	4.7	101	75
5	4.5	4.3	5.6	104	79
6	4.8	5.0	6.6	96	72
7	5.2	5.5	7.6	94	68
			Average	96	73
			Composite Test Data		
2	2.3	2.3	2.6	98	87
3	2.5	2.8	3.7	90	67
4	3.5	3.5	4.7	100	74
5	4.3	4.2	5.7	102	75
6	4.8	4.9	6.7	98	72
7	5.4	5.4	7.6	99	70
			Average	97	74

TABLE 3

LUCKIE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

PROFILES OF ACHIEVEMENT QUOTIENTS
IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS, APRIL, 1973

Grade	Grade Equivalent Score			Summary Indices	
	Actual Achievement	Predicted Achievement	National Norm	Predicted Achievement Quotient	National Achievement Quotient
			Reading Tests Data		
2	1.9	1.8	2.7	106	69
3	2.6	2.6	3.8	101	68
4	3.7	3.2	4.7	117	78
5	4.1	3.8	5.7	106	72
6	5.0	4.4	6.7	113	74
7	6.7	5.4	7.6	123	87
			Average	111	74
			Mathematics Test Data		
2	2.3	1.9	2.6	119	88
3	3.1	2.7	3.7	114	84
4	3.6	3.4	4.7	106	77
5	4.2	4.2	5.6	100	74
6	5.2	4.9	6.6	106	78
7	6.0	5.9	7.6	102	78
			Average	107	79
			Composite Test Data		
2	2.0	1.9	2.6	103	75
3	2.8	2.7	3.7	101	75
4	3.6	3.3	4.7	107	76
5	4.1	4.1	5.7	100	72
6	4.8	4.7	6.7	103	72
7	6.3	5.7	7.6	111	82
			Average	104	75

TABLE 4

FOWLER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

PROFILES OF ACHIEVEMENT QUOTIENTS
IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS, APRIL, 1973

Grade	Grade Equivalent Score: Actual Achievement	Grade Equivalent Score: Predicted Achievement	Grade Equivalent Score: National Norm	Summary Indices: Predicted Achievement Quotient	Summary Indices: National Achievement Quotient
			Reading Tests Data		
2	2.8	1.8	2.7	151	102
3	2.7	2.5	3.8	108	71
4	2.8	3.0	4.7	94	59
5	4.6	3.7	5.7	123	80
6	4.9	4.8	6.7	101	73
7	5.4	5.0	7.6	108	70
			Average	114	75
			Mathematics Test Data		
2	2.9	2.0	2.6	145	111
3	2.6	2.7	3.7	97	70
4	3.1	3.2	4.7	95	66
5	4.4	4.2	5.6	105	77
6	5.2	5.2	6.6	100	78
7	6.1	5.5	7.6	111	79
			Average	108	80
			Composite Test Data		
2	2.9	2.0	2.6	147	109
3	2.9	2.6	3.7	110	77
4	3.0	3.1	4.7	95	63
5	4.2	3.9	5.7	107	73
6	5.0	5.0	6.7	99	75
7	5.5	5.2	7.6	105	72
			Average	110	78

TABLE 5

Spring and Fall Mean Scores on the Reading Subtest of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills for the Tutored and Non-tutored Participants in the Right to Read Program

Herndon

	N	Spring 1973	N	Fall 1973
Tutored	16	4.2	14	4.7
Non-tutored	56	3.3	64	3.5

E.A. Ware

	N	Spring 1973	N	Fall 1973
Tutored	17	4.7	16	5.0
Non-tutored	55	3.5	44	3.8

Pupils were fourth graders in the spring, 1973, and fifth graders in the fall, 1973. Spring testing was done in April, 1973. Fall testing was done in late November, 1973.

Tutored mean increased by .6 while non-tutored increased by only .3.

* Tutored includes 4th grade which was not tested by project in fall Computations excluding 4th grade shows N = 20 mean = 3.7, for tutored and N = 53, mean = 3.3 for non tutored.

** Fourth grade not tested by project in fall.

TABLE 6

Fall 1973 Mean Scores on the Reading Subtest of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills for the Second to the Fifth Grades at the Schools in the Right to Read Program

Grades	Fowler		Herndon		Ware	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
2	-	-	75	1.8	54	1.7
3	32	2.6	116	2.4	62	2.6
4	29	3.2	87	2.8	72	2.9
5	22	3.9	74	3.5	59	4.1

					N	Mean
			124	3.2		
			93	3.7	64	4.0
			82	4.4	73	3.7
					55	4.7